Application No. 10/544,120

Paper Dated: November 21, 2008

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of August 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 0388-051649

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the claims have been restricted under 35 U.S.C. § 121 between the following groups:

Group I:

Claims 9-15 and 17-19, drawn to the sound detecting

mechanism; and

Group II:

Claim 16, drawn to the method of manufacturing the sound

detecting mechanism.

Applicants hereby provisionally elect for further prosecution the invention of Group I, claims 9-15 and 17-19, drawn to the sound detecting mechanism.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above-described election requirement on the grounds that no serious burden exists on the Examiner by examining the claims of Groups I and II in a single application. Applicants submit that the Examiner must explain by appropriate explanation why there would be a serious burden as opposed to merely stating that "one or more of the following reasons apply" without explaining how and which one of the reasons are applicable.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. Should the restriction requirement be maintained, Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application or take such other appropriate measures as Applicants deem necessary to protect the inventions recited within the non-elected inventions.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

Adam J. Komorowski

Registration No. 62,575

Attorney for Applicants

436 Seventh Avenue

700 Koppers Building

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Telephone: (412) 471-8815 Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com